



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/763,580

01/23/2004

John Carney

40004572-0023-002

7727

26263

7590

11/24/2009

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. BOX 061080

WACKER DRIVE STATION, WILLIS TOWER

CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

PARRA, OMAR S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2421

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/763,580	Applicant(s) CARNEY ET AL.	
	Examiner OMAR PARRA	Art Unit 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13,15-23 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-13, 15-23 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/07/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims **1, 12 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The newly added limitation '*refining the search results of*' on claim 1, line 12; claim 12, line 13 and claim 22, line 12, allegedly finds support on Fig. 4-6 and paragraphs [0020] and [0031]-[0035] of applicant's specifications, as stated by the applicant on the Amendment filed 10/07/2009 on page 9 line 7.

After closely reviewing applicant's specification, especially on the cited portions, the examiner found no support for "*refining the search results*" limitation. The cited portions refer to adding or including categories and parameters related to programs containing, for example, real state, dating and car shopping information. This, however, does not refine search results, as claimed, but gives another topics to search for on a regular profile search. In other words, these passages do not refer to receiving results and then being able to refine those results by adding those categories.

However, for prosecution purposes, the examiner will treat the 'refine search results' as adding categories or modifying the search after receiving search results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims **1, 2, 4-13, 15-23 and 26-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Begeja et al. (hereinafter 'Begeja', Pub. No. US 2003/0030752, of

Art Unit: 2421

record) in view of Holtz et al. (hereinafter 'Holtz', Patent No. 6,760,916, of record) in further view of McCoskey et al. (hereinafter 'McCoskey', Pub. No. 2003/0028889).

Regarding claims 1, 12 and 22, Begeja teaches a system (with corresponding method and computer-readable medium) comprising:

a server ("**Video Server**", **220 Fig.2**, or "**Video Storage**", **210 Fig.2**, if more **storage is needed**) storing VOD content (**[0031] lines 1-2**), the VOD content including defined by a plurality of VOD clip categories (**[0051] lines 3-4**),, each VOD clip category containing one or more corresponding ones of the VOD clips (**[0051] lines 4-5**); and

a set top box (**370, Fig.3**) communicatively coupled to the server (**220, Fig.3**), the set top box storing an application (**[0058] lines 4-5 or [0015] paragraph-lines 2-5 of incorporated by reference application, Begeja Pub. No. 2003/0163815**), the application configured to provide a user with a VOD clip category selection functionality (**[0054] lines 3-4; [0051] lines 3-4**) that enables the user to select from among the plurality of VOD clip categories and a VOD clip parameter selection functionality (**Buttons, Drop-down menus and check boxes, Fig. 4-5**), a VOD clip metadata search attribute functionality that allows the user to provide one or more VOD clip metadata search attributes, each of tile VOID clip metadata search attributes refining of one or more VOD clips corresponding to a respective one of the VOD clip categories such that the composite VOD clip consists of a subset of the one or more VOD clips corresponding to each selected VOD clip category (**the system generates metadata, 215, 225, Fig. 2; [0023]; [0044], by analyzing the video content, [0038]-[0041]. This**

Art Unit: 2421

metadata contains attributes or characteristics that describe the video content and are used for the search of the video, [0024]; [0044]). The user is able to search the metadata by specifying the category or topic and the subtopics that define the clips he/she desires, [0059]; [0061]; [0070]. The system, then, selects the video clips that have those characteristics, and in this way, filtering out the ones that don't, [0055]; [0060]); and

a VOD clip composite functionality configured to automatically create the composite VOD clip to include one or more corresponding VOD clips from each of the selected VOD clip categories assembled according to the selected VOD clip parameters of each selected VOD clip category ([0028] ¶ lines 1-3; [0059] lines 9-10 or see 405, Fig.4).

On the other hand, Begeja does not explicitly teach the selection of the VOD parameters defining how individual ones of the VOD clips from selected ones of the VOD clip categories will be assembled into a composite VOD clip.

However, in an analogous art, Holtz teaches a VOD multimedia production and distribution system that assembles a media production from a variety of sources based on personal preferences (Abstract). Holtz teaches that for setting the user preferences or the type of content he/she wants, a VOD clips attribute selection functionality is presented to him/her in order to let the system know what categories are desired, how long he/she wants the production or clips to be, etc (col. 13 lines 3-31; col. 16 line 4-col. 17 line 5; col. 31 line 18-col. 32 line 64). By specifying the length of the video, the number of segments is affected. In other words, the higher the length of the video is, the

Art Unit: 2421

higher the number of segments included, and vice versa. In other words, this selection affects how the individual ones of the VOD clips will be assembled into the composite video clip. Holtz also explicitly teach that the number of video segments can also be selected (col. 16 lines 42-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Begeja's invention with Holtz's feature of letting the user to define video clips attributes through an interface for the benefit of providing to the user a neat, easy to fill up interface for customizing the video clips or content to be received.

Additionally, Begeja and Holtz do not explicitly teach refining search results of the video search.

However, in an analogous art, McCoskey teaches having an aggregator that will search for video content (Abstract; [0017]-[0019]) from many sources ([0044]) when an inquiry is submitted. McCoskey teaches that the search results interface will always have features for sorting the results in a certain way, refining the received results, etc ([0103]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Begeja and Holtz's invention with McCoskey feature of refining search results for the benefit of letting the user to reduce the number of results if he/she does not have the enough time to watch them all or if he/she is interested in only one topic out of the search criteria at a given moment.

Regarding claims 2, 13, and 23, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach presenting the composite VOD clip to a user to effect a passive viewing experience (**[0053] lines 19-20**).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein the composite VOD clip consists of a subset of the one or more VOD clips corresponding to the selected VOD clip parameters in each selected VOD clip category (**565, Fig.5**).

Regarding claims 5, 16 and 25, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein the one or more VOD clip parameters includes a VOD clip parameter selected from the group consisting of a random selection parameter (**420, Fig.4, “Play all clips” without knowing what’s going to play is a random selection**), a maximum number parameter, a maximum time parameter, and a sequential parameter (**[0065] lines 2-4**).

Regarding claims 6, 17 and 26, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein the composite VOD clip is automatically regenerated (**[0026] lines 7-10**) upon user request (**“instant search”, [0058], paragraph-line 2**) or according to an externally specified schedule (**“...on a periodic basis...” [0026], line 9**).

Regarding claims 7, 18 and 27, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein one or more VOD clips made available prior to a specified time (**405, Fig.4, videos are available prior user’s selection**) are removed from the composite VOD clip (**“AT&T, 8**

Art Unit: 2421

clips”, “Jay Lenos White H... 10 clips”, “Sports, 6 clips”, see Fig.4, are removed after choosing “Politics”; 505, Fig. 5).

Regarding claims 8, 19 and 28, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein one or more corresponding VOD clips previously presented to a user **(405, Fig.4, videos are available prior user’s selection)** are removed from the composite VOD clip **(“AT&T, 8 clips”, “Jay Lenos White H... 10 clips”, “Sports, 6 clips”, see Fig.4, are removed after choosing “Politics”; 505, Fig. 5).**

Regarding claims 9, 20 and 29, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein one or more additional VOD clips are included as component VOD clips of the composite VOD clip **(“The user can add a new topic using button 425, Fig.4” [0062] paragraph line 3, which inherently would add more clips to the composite video).**

Regarding claims 10, 21 and 30, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach wherein the one or more additional VOD clips comprise VOD clips selected from the group consisting of advertising VOD clips **([0057] lines 19-21)**, promotional VOD clips pertaining to VOD content unrelated to the composite VOD clip **(“Additional marketing and advertising (such as a commercial...)”, [0057] paragraph lines 19-20)**, and promotional VOD clips pertaining to VOD content related to the composite VOD clip **(“Relevant information that might be embedded into a media stream being**

Art Unit: 2421

delivered...might include...information about the subject matter of the stream or related thereto, such as advertising...”, [0087] paragraph lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 11, Begeja, Holtz and McCoskey teach a method wherein one or more additional graphical or data contents, including content tickers, graphical ads or promotional contents unrelated to the composite VOD clip, and content tickers, graphical ads or promotional contents related to the composite VOD clip **([0087] paragraph lines 5-7 or also, 555, Fig.5)** are added alongside or partially overlay the composite VOD clip.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMAR PARRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1449. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6 PM (M-F, every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2421

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

OP